

DU

625

.p 77

BUHR B



a39015



00033351



1b

*Political Value of the Hawaiian Treaty*





*In Memory of*  
**STEPHEN SPAULDING**  
*1907 - 1925*  
*CLASS of 1927*  
**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN**

DU  
625  
P77  
Probably 1853.

## POLITICAL VALUE OF THE HAWAIIAN TREATY.

The peculiar interest of the people of the United States in the Hawaiian Islands dates back to 1820, when the first band of American missionaries went out to that then benighted country. Prior to that time the Islands had been visited by a few naval and merchant vessels, and some considerable trade had been carried on, especially in the sandal-wood traffic with China. But the country was under the cloud of heathenism and had no law save the will of the King.

Through the unaided efforts of American missionaries the government was brought up to a standard never reached by any other savage race, and by their advice and influence the rulers were restrained and guided in the right way until it became a constitutional monarchy in the family of nations. In the interim of passing from ignorance and idolatry to knowledge and Christianity, the Islands were more than once threatened with, and barely saved from the fate of so many of the Pacific groups. Both England and France viewed them with longing and jealous eye, and officials and subjects of both those countries tried to force the native King into committing some act which might be made an excuse for seizing the sovereignty. It was due to the vigilance and untiring energy of the men who imposed that little band of American laborers in the cause of religion and civilization that the schemes and intrigues of these designing foreigners were baffled and brought to naught.

When, in 1839, the French required of the King a deposit of \$20,000, as security for certain claims made by them, it was the American merchants who furnished the money, and thus prevented the seizure of the Islands. And when, in 1843, Lord George Paulet, in command of Her British Majesty's frigate *Carysfort*, demanded a "voluntary" cession of the Islands at his cannon's mouth, it was the sage advice and admirable diplomacy of Dr. Judd, an American missionary, which thwarted the object of the ambitious Englishman and saved the little kingdom.

A glance at the map of the North Pacific Ocean should be enough to convince any one of the political and commercial importance of these Islands to the United States. If they were situated in the Atlantic as they are in the Pacific, and the center of political and commercial influences equally important to our Eastern coast, secured

55625

UN

by a treaty that had been acquiesced in by the great European powers, would any American statesman propose to abrogate such treaty and cast them adrift because of the remission of duty upon fifty thousand tons of sugar per annum?

How much did it cost this country and prolong the civil war that Nassau was under foreign control?

The growing importance of American commerce in the Pacific was well expressed by Mr. Seward in his speech in the Senate on that subject:

“Who does not see that henceforth, every year, European commerce, European politics, European thought, and European activity, although actually gaining greater force; and European connections, although actually becoming more intimate, will, nevertheless, ultimately sink in importance, while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast region beyond, will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter.”

This political importance has been conceded by the opponents as well as friends of the treaty. Hon. Phillip A. Thomas, of Maryland, in a speech in opposition to the treaty, said:

“Great Britain, they say, will seize upon these Islands if the treaty does not become the supreme law of the land.” \* \* \* “They forget that the ‘Monroe Doctrine’ is still extant in this Government, and that that doctrine will be enforced against Great Britain or any other power that may seize upon or attempt to hold these Islands. If the presence of any one of them there should prove to be a standing menace to the vital interests of the United States on the Pacific coast, or if possession were held with hostile intent towards our country or its people, the policy of this Government in such an emergency was foreshadowed by Mr. Webster, as Secretary of State, in the administration of President Tyler, when, in reference to these very Islands, he wrote that ‘the Government of the United States would look with displeasure upon any effort of any other government to acquire any preponderating influence over the government of the Hawaiian Islands.’ And referring to the rumor then current that the French would probably take possession of the Islands, he said that he ‘trusted that they would not take possession, but if they did they would be dislodged if it took the whole power of the Government to do it.’” “Rest assured, Mr. Speaker,” said Mr. Thomas, “that the same policy will be pursued whenever Great Britain, or any other foreign government, with intent to destroy the peace or menace the interests of our Pacific States, shall undertake to assert dominion over the Sandwich Islands. They will be dislodged if it takes the whole power of the Government to do it.”

Hon. J. H. Reagan, of Texas, also in opposition, said on March 4, 1882:

"If I am asked what I would do to protect our commerce on the Pacific Ocean and to guard our Pacific coast against the dangers of assault from great naval powers, I would say that I have great confidence in the wise expression of Mr. Webster, when Secretary of State, who said: 'We cannot permit another power to take possession of these Islands.' We occupy a position which enables us, if we will be just to other nations, to say to them that they shall not menace our national security. A policy indicated through the State Department of a determination to permit no other power in violation of the 'Monroe doctrine'—and in extension of it if you please, if that can be called an extension which would reach to the Hawaiian Islands—that we will not permit any other government or power to occupy, fortify, and hold these Islands, will afford us all the security we may need."

Did these gentlemen count the difference in cost between holding a position gained, and in dislodging another from such a position? The *Virginus*' naval demonstration alone cost five millions of dollars. What would it have cost to dislodge Spain from Cuba?

On this subject the Hon. E. H. Allen, late Hawaiian Minister, laid before the House Committee on Foreign Relations, in February and March, 1882, the following as a part of his statement:

"You are well aware, gentlemen, that the first great effort for the Christian civilization of the Hawaiian people was made by missionaries from the United States, who were aided by other good men from this and other countries, and while the King, chiefs, and people were making every effort to advance in education and the arts of civilized life, they were occasionally embarrassed by political interference from other nations.

"The United States being largely interested in the commercial relations of that country, President Tyler, Mr. Webster being Secretary of State, transmitted to Congress a message, dated December 31, 1842, in which he said:

"Just emerging from a state of barbarism, the government of the Islands is as yet feeble, but its dispositions appear to be just and pacific, and it seems anxious to improve the condition of its people by the introduction of religious and moral institutions, means of education, and the arts of civilized life. It cannot but be in conformity with the wishes of the Government and the people of the United States, that the community thus existing, in the midst of a vast expanse of ocean, should be respected, and all its rights strictly and conscientiously regarded. And this must also be the true interest of all other commercial States. Far remote from the dominions of European powers, its growth and prosperity, as an independent State, may yet be in a high degree useful to all whose trade is extended to those regions; while its nearer approach to this continent and the intercourse which American vessels have with it—such vessels constituting five-sixths of all which annually visit it—could not but create dissatisfaction on the part of the United States at any attempt by another power, should such an attempt be threatened or feared, to take possession of the Islands, colonize them and subvert the native government. Considering, therefore, that the United States possess so very

large a share of the intercourse with those Islands, it is deemed not unfit to make the declaration that their government seeks, nevertheless, no exclusive control over the Hawaiian government, but is content with its independent existence, and anxiously wishes for its security and prosperity. Its forbearance in this respect, under the circumstances of the very large intercourse of their citizens with the Islands would justify this Government, should events hereafter arise to require it, in making a decided remonstrance against the adoption of an opposite policy by any other power.

“These were the sentiments of this Government at this early day.

“On the 25th of February, 1843, the captain of an English man-of-war took possession of the Islands, and the flag of that nation waved for some months over the country. The British admiral, however, examined into the cause of the difficulty, and finding that there were no grounds of complaint, surrendered the possession to the Hawaiian government.

“A few years later a trouble arose with the French. They had taken possession of Tahiti and the island of Morea, which, as I am informed, are annexed to the French Republic, and it was thought that France had imperial aspirations for increasing her possessions.

“A French protectorate has since been established over the whole of the lower archipelago—some sixty-eight islands.

“One cause of this trouble was that the Hawaiian government would not alter their tariff of duties, which at that time was very high on brandy. This traffic was necessarily restricted, as the use of liquors by the people of the Islands was regarded dangerous to their existence.

“There were other causes of irritation also, and it was thought that the French would seize the Islands. The French commissioner was accompanied by a man-of-war, and so apprehensive was the Government that possession would be taken, that there were placed at the chief ports of the Islands the American flag, with orders to raise it when news arrived that the French had taken possession of the capital.

“At this critical moment the prominent Americans at the Islands urged me, as I was then consul of the United States at Honolulu, to come to the United States and make known to this Government the state of affairs. I came and presented the case to Mr. Webster, and, after he had duly considered the subject, I well remember his words, pronounced in his impressive manner:

“I trust the French will not take possession, but if they do, they will be dislodged, if my advice is taken, if the whole power of the Government is required to do it.

“The opinion of the American Government having been made known, it had its effect. In view of what had passed the Hawaiian government desired to make a treaty which should make their relations more intimate with the United States. A minister was sent to Washington to negotiate a treaty. This was during President Pierce's administration, Mr. Marcy, one of the most eminent statesmen of his day, being Secretary of State. A treaty of reciprocity was negoti-



ated, not, however, with any political clause, and with a free list far less favorable to the United States than the present one.

"It had the support of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it came up for consideration at the time the question of the admission of Kansas and Nebraska into the Union was before Congress. The discussion of this and the kindred subject of slave and free labor, carried on with all the earnestness incident to that period, occupied the time and attention of that body so largely that the proposed treaty was suffered to fall. Another treaty with similar provisions was made by order of Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, but it never went into operation.

"The subject of a reciprocity treaty was under discussion at different times for twenty-one years before the present treaty was approved. No measure has ever had higher indorsement by the most eminent statesmen of the country, both Republican and Democratic.

"The treaty was earnestly recommended by many of the officials of the United States who had represented their country at the Islands, and by General Schofield, of the Army, who had visited the Islands, and made a careful examination of their position and condition, as will be seen by his letter, which is incorporated in the speech of Mr. Wood, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He writes to the Hon. Mr. Luttrell, a member of the House, as follows:

"HEADQUARTERS MILITARY DIVISION OF THE PACIFIC,  
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *December 30, 1875.*

"DEAR SIR: Knowing your interest in the subject, I venture to give you my views in respect to the Hawaiian treaty, which is soon to come before Congress for legislative action.

"The Hawaiian Islands constitute the only natural outpost to the defenses of the Pacific coast.

"In the possession of a foreign naval power, in time of war, as a depot from which to fit out hostile expeditions against this coast and our commerce on the Pacific Ocean, they would afford the means of incalculable injury to the United States.

"If the absolute neutrality of the islands could always be insured, that would suffice; but they have not, and never can have the power to maintain their own neutrality, and now their necessities force them to seek alliance with some nation which can relieve their embarrassment.

"The British Empire, through its North Pacific and South Sea colonies, stands ready to enter into such an alliance, and thus complete its chain of naval stations from Australia to British Columbia. We cannot refuse the Islands the little aid they need, and at the same time deny their right to seek it elsewhere. The time has come when we must secure forever the desired control over those Islands, or let it pass into other hands.

"The financial interest to the United States involved in this treaty is very small, and if it were much greater it would still be insignificant when compared to the importance of such a military and naval station to the national security and welfare.

"I am, dear sir, yours, very truly,

"J. M. SCHOFIELD.

"HON. J. K. LUTTRELL, M. C.,

"Washington, D. C.

"Admiral Porter addresses a letter to the Hon. Mr. Wood, which is incorporated in his speech in support of the treaty, in which he fully sustains the views of General Schofield. The naval officers who have visited the Islands have been in accord on the subject of intimate commercial relations with the Islands, always bearing in view their future destiny.

"The London *Times* thus refers to a harbor at the Islands :

"The maritime power which holds Pearl River Harbor, and moors her fleet there, holds the key of the North Pacific.

"Sir George Simpson, in his travels around the world, says :

"That this archipelago is far more valuable on this account that it neither is nor can ever be shared by a rival.

"These are the only islands which can form an outpost to the defenses of the Pacific States. There are no others. They have no rival; and in this consists their great value. They are totally unlike a single island in the West Indies as an outpost of defense.

"The following is an extract of the minority report of the Committee on Ways and Means, made in the House of Representatives on the Hawaiian treaty:

"Much stress is laid by the report of the majority upon the importance to the United States of obtaining a foothold upon these Islands in the interests of our Pacific commerce with the continent of Asia, and of our safety in case of future wars with any great naval power.

"The undersigned are not insensible to these considerations. No European power should be permitted to obtain the sovereignty of the Islands, or to gain such influence in them as to menace our security. To allow this would be contrary to the well-established canons of American policy, sanctioned by nearly a century of traditions, and by the conceded maxims of international law. No European power can deny to us the peculiar right to exclude them from possessing what would be a standing menace of danger to us, and the possession of which, by us, would be no menace to them.

"The following extract from a recent report of Commodore R. W. Shufeldt, of the United States Navy, on the commercial importance of the Corea, present and future, in its relation to America, will be found to be of great interest:

"The acquisition of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, the treaties with Japan, Sandwich Islands and Samoa, are only corollaries to the proposition that the Pacific Ocean is to become at no distant day the commercial domain of America. The Atlantic, either by force of circumstances or national indifference, has been given over to foreign flags, backed by the immense weight of European capital, but under natural laws the flow of commerce, as of emigration, is from the east toward the west, and the geographical position of the United States, in conformity with this law, points to the Pacific Ocean as the main highway of trade, and our country as the source from which the Oriental nations must obtain whatever they need in the way of commercial exchange. In all probability, within the next half century, the United States will find its largest market in Asia rather than Europe.

"The London *Times* of August 25, 1882, publishes a naval letter from Hong-Kong, under date of December 19, thus :





"It having been reported that a large extension of the Russian naval station was in progress at Vladivostock, the place has been visited by Vice-Admiral Willes, and what he there saw has apparently made so much impression upon him that a long dispatch has been transmitted to the admiralty upon the subject. A new dock for repairing ships and a slip for constructing small armed crafts are in hand. A factory for the manufacture of torpedoes and additional batteries to strengthen the defense of the place is employing several hundreds of hands in its construction. The Siberian flotilla, instead of comprising, as in the past, two aged schooners and three obsolete gun-vessels, now consists of two floating batteries, four schooners, and five gunboats of the newest description. For the moment Russia appears to have abandoned her hostile intentions upon Corea, but she seems to be none the less determined to constitute herself the leading naval power in the North Pacific.

"There are three powerful commercial nations that have large interests in the North Pacific besides the United States, viz: Great Britain, Russia, and China. France and Germany are a power in the South Pacific. Jarvis, the historian of Hawaii, says:

"That they hold the key of the Pacific Ocean, for no trade could prosper or even exist while a hostile power, possessing an active and powerful marine, should send out its cruisers to prey upon commerce; but once firmly established on them it might put at defiance any means of attack which could be brought to bear against them. Hence the commercial countries have been jealous lest some of them should have a superior influence.

"General Grant, in a letter from China, during his visit around the world wrote:

"My belief is that in less time from now than half a century Europe will be complaining of the rapid advance of China.

\* \* \* \* \*

"President Lincoln, in reply to an accredited minister from Hawaii, said:

"In every light in which the State of the Hawaiian Islands can be contemplated, it is an object of profound interest for the United States. Virtually it was once a colony; it is now a near and intimate neighbor. It is a haven of shelter and refreshment for our merchants, fishermen, seamen, and other citizens, when on their lawful occasions they are navigating the Eastern seas and oceans. The people are free, and its laws, language, and religion are largely the fruits of our own teachings and examples.

"When it is said that the United States have lost by the treaty for the reason that they always would have had the trade, the impoverished condition of the Islands fully attested that there would have been very little trade for any country; and had this treaty not been made, or one with some other commercial country, the group would have rapidly continued to retrograde as a producing country, even if the struggle could have been continued as it was many years prior to the treaty, causing general bankruptcy and ruin to almost every one who had become interested in the production of sugar."

Ex-Senator and Secretary George S. Boutwell, before the same committee, remarked:

*4m*

"Now as to the value of the concession made in the fourth article of the treaty, which I will read :

"It is agreed, on the part of His Hawaiian Majesty, that, so long as this treaty shall remain in force, he will not lease or otherwise dispose of or create any lien upon any port, harbor, or other territory in his dominions, or grant any special privileges or rights of use therein to any other power, state, or government, nor make any treaty by which any other nation shall obtain the same privileges, relative to the admission of any articles free of duty, hereby secured to the United States.'

"That, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is the great consideration involved in the treaty. There is nothing of large public concern in it except that. As to our duties, whether we get half a million dollars more or less, with revenues of three hundred millions a year, easily gathered and without burden on anybody, if this measure, in an appreciable degree, contributes to the security of the Pacific coast, or if, in that future, which we may now contemplate as certain, it secures for us an *entrepot*, a depot, a perpetual security for our commerce on the Pacific Ocean, then I submit that this slight concession which we make to this people is of no concern to us. The Hawaiian Islands must be allied to somebody. Great Britain has interests in the Pacific Ocean. She has vast possessions there. She has 240,000,000 subjects in the East Indies. She has islands in every sea. And any one who has any knowledge whatever of English practice, and of English tradition, and of the purposes of the English government, must anticipate that whenever we let go our hold on these Islands they will be taken possession of by England, through a treaty of reciprocity in the first instance, and then by a protectorate, and afterwards as a colony. On the 20th parallel north, midway between Asia and America, there will be a post in the possession of a government which has never for centuries, except in one or two instances, relinquished her grasp upon a foot of land, whether it was valuable or valueless in a money point of view. Wherever it could plant its flag it has maintained its power."

But it may be argued that in face of the protest of the United States no nation would take possession or strive to acquire superior rights in the Hawaiian Islands.

Suppose the commercial supremacy which Australia was rapidly gaining in 1872-'3 had been permitted to go on unchecked by the treaty negotiated in 1874, and the islands had become as thoroughly Anglicized as they are now Americanized, with what grace could the United States have objected to British influence and control? Great Britain always contended that she did not desire to annex the Fiji Islands, but was compelled to do so to protect British commercial interests that had grown up spontaneously. And with how much less grace could the United States protest if they deliberately abrogate a treaty which has given form and shape to the policy insisted upon by American statesmen for forty years! Such an abrogation would

be a virtual acknowledgment that the policy was deliberately abandoned, after which it would not lie in the mouth of the United States to protest against any other nation taking up what she had by a solemn act abandoned. Such a retreat from the position now gained, especially in view of the completion of an isthmian canal, would be paramount to an abandonment of any hopes of commercial supremacy in the Pacific.

If statesmen of the past had the prescience to foresee and claim for the United States the advantages lying in the control of this group of Islands, with how much more emphasis should such control be claimed by statesmen in this day when a canal is being made by foreign capital which will *debouche* in the face of this group on which the commerce of the East, which seeks the canal, must rely for a port of supplies and repair!

No new treaty which could now be negotiated would be likely to receive the sanctions the present treaty has gained, and become a part of the international law regarding Hawaii.

Says the Oakland, California, *Times*, December 18, 1883:

"On our Atlantic coast all of the near lying islands are controlled by other governments. England dominates Jamaica and the Bahamas, Spain possesses Cuba, and Denmark St. Thomas, while Hayti is semi-barbarous. But on that coast our own Government is strong enough in equipment, fortification and resources to be more indifferent to such environment that it can afford to be here. Driven out of friendly relations, which thrive on reciprocal trade, with Hawaii, our coast line will be naked to the ocean and defenseless, with not a friendly port in the sea where an American ship can cast anchor.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The abrogation of the Hawaii treaty means the greatest contribution in our power to offer to England's monopoly of the traffic, the industry, the profits of the whole globe. We have stood guard over those Islands while they underwent the pangs of transformation from barbarism to civilization. Commerce, under our protection, has transfigured them and now they are in the last stage of development in which they approximate our features and take on the form of absolute assimilation, and we are asked to abandon them and drop the profitable and ripened results of a third of a century's care and culture into the waiting lap of England!

"The completion of the Canada Pacific Railroad sharpens England's anxiety to supplant us in Hawaii. She covets the Island trade for that Sound port which is to be the terminus of her Pacific road. She seeks near our shores a naval station where her war ships may shelter and her merchant marine find profit and protection.

"We have by wrong commercial policies abandoned the rest of the world to England. We have given over to her the seas where once we disputed her supremacy. Coast after coast and island after

island has been nailed to her empire until she has coiled herself around the world like a serpent."

It may be asked: "How does this treaty secure to the United States these advantages?" The interpretation of treaties always involves something more than the meaning of particular and isolated articles and clauses. No statesman or diplomat can read this treaty without recognizing at once the force and effect, the scope and intent, of the treaty as a whole. It was more than a mere commercial treaty. It truly puts the commerce of the two countries on a satisfactory basis, without embarrassing the revenue of Hawaii to too great an extent, and is, and will be, so long as the high tariff on sugar is retained, somewhat favorable to Hawaii. If it were not so there would be no excuse for the fourth article, which applies only to Hawaii, restraining her from admitting, free of duty, the goods of other countries, or permitting any other country to get any territory or right to use territory therein. It is this fact that Hawaii had a temporary advantage in the other articles of the treaty, that gives the fourth article its great force. This article was not carelessly worded by the prudent and sagacious American statesman who framed it. It was not intended to be offensive to the Hawaiian King. Its effects were carefully calculated. It was based upon the idea of interfering as little as possible with Hawaiian independence, so long as that could be maintained, but providing for the direction in which the control of the Islands should go, when it was no longer possible to maintain it.

No greater testimony to the importance of the treaty could be given than that it was at once recognized by the quick appreciation of British, French and German statesmen, who made strenuous protests against it, Great Britain going so far as to say to the Hawaiian government that they "could not allow" its provisions to come into force. The Hawaiian government was involved in a long and tedious diplomatic negotiation, extending over four years, with, however, very favorable results; Great Britain agreeing to the termination of one article of her treaty, which was thought to be infringed, and Germany agreeing that so long as this treaty lasted she would not claim the same rights and privileges. It follows, therefore, that so long as this treaty lasts, the superior rights of the United States have and enjoy the formal recognition of the Powers—abrogate it and the Powers would doubtless claim equal rights again. How far these governments were influenced in yielding to the diplomatic representations of Hawaiian statesmen, by the hope that Congress would

abrogate the treaty, cannot be told ; but that they would regard its abrogation as a great gain to them, there is no doubt.

In the volume of Foreign Relations of the United States, of 1878, will be found an account of the difficulties met by the Hawaiian government. There is no doubt, however, of the scope and intent of the treaty in the minds of practiced diplomats.

Aside from this diplomatic view the treaty undoubtedly does foster the silent but potent forces which mould a nation, and fix its destiny, as it was anticipated it would do. Read in the light of to-day the following remarks of Hon. Elijah Ward, of New York, in the Forty-fourth Congress on the subject of the treaty, show a wise and far-seeing statesmanship as to how the treaty was to secure the advantages aimed at :

“ Mr. Speaker, I have observed with much pleasure that the convention for the extension of the trade of the United States with the Hawaiian Islands was advised in the Senate by the triumphant majority of 51 against 12 votes, and has been sent to this House for its approval and appropriate legislation. Under the policy which has now for many years controlled the legislation of this country, the industry of the people has been unduly diverted to manufacturing pursuits. Over-production and a want of employment have followed. For the present the home demand can scarcely be increased, and it has become incumbent on Congress to do whatever is fairly in its power to open or extend markets abroad. This is one of the direct results which will be accomplished by the proposed treaty, and hence it should be supported by the representatives of the people without distinction of party.

\* \* \* \* \*

“ The purchase of a preponderating interest in the Suez Canal has justly been regarded as a masterpiece of statesmanship and far-seeing policy on the part of Great Britain. Its object is to maintain for that country its supremacy in oriental trade. I regard the treaty with the Hawaiian Islands as scarcely less important to our people than the control of the Suez Canal is to British subjects. China and Japan are among the chief fields for our commercial and manufacturing enterprise, and it is of the utmost importance that we should possess adequate naval stations in the Pacific Ocean.

“ For these reasons I regard the Hawaiian Islands, although no part of this continent, yet as commercially, politically, and in fact as part of its appurtenances, and to be properly included in the application of the Monroe doctrine, prohibiting the intervention of European powers in them. Of this it was well said by President Johnson in his message of December 5, 1865, that it has as law been ‘ sanctioned by time, and by its good results has approved itself to both continents.’

“ It appears to me that however just and proper and gratifying to an honorable national pride the Monroe doctrine in itself may be, it

is imperfect and little more than a barren ideality, unless, in an enlightened self-interest, we associate it with a friendly care for the commercial and material prosperity of the States we have so far taken under our protection. If we prohibit the interference of European nations with the States of this continent, shall we stop at that point and cultivate no further increase of friendly relations with them? I for one have the strongest possible faith in the manifest destiny of our people, and that a series of united States will exist from the cold regions of the North, so far as they can be inhabited by civilized man, down to the southern verge of the American continent, and include the islands adjacent to it. We, with our rapidly increasing 40,000,000 of people, shall be, so to speak, the key-stone of the arch—no barrier in the way of their intercourse, but doing all we can to facilitate it, we ourselves necessarily partaking, in at least as high a degree as any other, in the prosperity which would thus be inaugurated and established.

“The policy I have described could not fail to command the admiration and good-will of liberal and enlightened statesmen throughout the world. I commend to your attention the wise and noble thoughts of John Bright, expressed in the British Parliament, on the development of the Monroe doctrine in a civilized and unobjectionable form, throughout the whole length and breadth of the American continent and the adjacent islands. In reply to Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Mr. Bright said :

“There cannot be a meaner motive than this that I am speaking of in forming a judgment on this question, that it is ‘better for us’ (meaning the people of Great Britain) that the American continent should be as the continent of Europe is, severed into many States and subject to all the contentions and disasters which have accompanied the history of the States of Europe.

“I should say that, if a man had a great heart within him, he would rather look forward to the day when from that point of land which is habitable nearest to the pole to the shores of the great gulf the whole of that vast continent might become one great federation of States, that, without a great army and without a great navy, not mixing itself up with the entanglements of European politics, without a custom-house inside through the whole length and breadth of its territory, but with freedom everywhere, equality everywhere, law everywhere, peace everywhere, would afford at least some hope that man is not forsaken of heaven and that the future of our race might be better than the past.”

The activity of the partisans of British influence in the Hawaiian Islands to endeavor to induce the Hawaiian government to withdraw from its present engagements and accept the boon of cheap East India coolie labor (now denied them), under British protection, in place of the free market of America, shows that they still entertain hopes of the abrogation of the treaty, the importance of which British diplomats do not fail to see. *Aprpos* of this the American Minister, General Comley, reported in 1881, under date August 29, to the United States Government:

"I have had occasion formerly to report to the Secretary of State the discomfort felt by the British Commissioner and other residents here, on account of the predominance of United States influence and interests in the Hawaiian Islands.

"The watchfulness of the Commissioner to find means of undermining this influence has been constant. \* \* \* \*

"There has been a systematic and indomitable struggle to force the Hawaiian government into a convention for the importation of East India coolies, so as to give the English a separate judicature and furnish innumerable opportunities for meddlesome interference with the internal affairs of this Government."

This warning called forth from Secretary Blaine two dispatches, which laid down the position of the United States Government as follows:

*In dispatch of November 19, 1881.*

\* \* \* \*

"But if negotiations such as you describe are really in progress, you will ask for an interview with the Secretary for Foreign Affairs and make the following representation of the views of the United States:

"The Government of the United States has with unvarying consistency manifested respect for the Hawaiian Kingdom, and an earnest desire for the welfare of its people." \* \* \* \*

"The Government of the United States has always avowed, and now repeats, that under no circumstances will it permit the transfer of the territory or sovereignty of these Islands to any of the great European Powers. It is needless to restate the reasons upon which that determination rests. It is too obvious for argument that the possession of these islands by a great maritime power would not only be a dangerous diminution of the just and necessary influence of the United States in the waters of the Pacific, but, in case of international difficulty, it would be a positive threat to interests too large and important to be lightly risked." \* \* \* \*

Again, more fully, under date of December 1, 1882:

"SIR: My late instructions, and especially that of the 19th ult., will have shown you the deep interest with which the United States observes the course of events in the Hawaiian Islands. The apparent disposition to extend other influence therein on lines parallel to or offsetting our own, must be watched with care and considerable firmness. The intelligent and suggestive character of your recent dispatches naturally leads me to a review of the relationship of the Hawaiian Kingdom to the United States at a somewhat greater length than was practicable in the limited scope of my instruction of November 19th. That dispatch was necessarily confined to the consideration of the immediate question of possible treaty engagements with Great Britain, which would give to that power in Hawaii a degree of extra territory, of jurisdiction inconsistent with the relations of the Islands to other powers, and especially to the United States.

With the abandonment of a feudal government by King Kamehameha III. in 1839, and the inauguration of constitutional methods, the history of the political relations of Hawaii to the world at large may very properly be said to begin. The recognition of independent sovereignty by the great Powers took place soon after, which act on the part of the United States, dated from 1844. Even at that early day before the United States had become a power on the Pacific coast, the commercial activity of our people was manifested in their intercourse with the Islands of Oceanica, of which the Hawaiian group is the northern extremity. In 1848, the treaty of Gaudalupe Hidalgo confirmed the territorial extension of the United States to the Pacific, and gave to the Union a coast line on that ocean little inferior in extent, and superior in natural wealth, to the Atlantic seaboard of the original thirteen States. In 1848-'49, the discoveries of gold in California laid the foundation of the marvelous development of the western coast, and that same year the necessities of our altered relationship to the Pacific Ocean found expression in a compromise treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation with the sovereign King of Hawaii.

"Hawaiian interests must inevitably turn toward the United States in the future as the present, as the natural and sole ally in conserving the dominion of both in the Pacific trade. This Government has on previous occasions been brought face to face with the question of a protectorate over the Hawaiian group. It has, as often as it arose, been set aside in the interest of such commercial union and such reciprocity benefits as would give Hawaii the highest advantages, and at the same time strengthen its independent existence as a sovereign State. In this I have summed up the whole disposition of the United States toward Hawaii in its proper condition. The policy of this country with regard to the Pacific, is the natural complement of its Atlantic policy. The history of our European relations for fifty years shows the zealous concern with which the United States has guarded its control of the coast from foreign interference, and this without the extension of territorial possessions beyond the mainland. It has always been its aim to preserve the friendly neutrality of the adjacent States and insular possessions.

"The United States was one of the first among the great nations of the world to take active interest in upbuilding Hawaiian independence and the creation of political life for its people. It has consistently endeavored, and with success, to enlarge the material prosperity of Hawaii. On such an independent basis it proposes to be equally unremitting in its efforts hereafter to maintain and develop the advantages which accrued to Hawaii, and draw closer the ties which imperatively unite her to the great body of the American commonwealth. In this line of action the United States does its simple duty both to Hawaii and itself, and it cannot permit such obvious neglect of national interest as would be involved by silent acquiescence in any movement looking to a lessening of those amenities, and the substitution of alien and hostile interests. It firmly believes the position of the Hawaiian Islands, as a key to the domin-



ion of the American Pacific, demands neutrality, to which end it will earnestly co-operate with the native government, and if, through any cause, the maintenance of such position, neutrality should be found by Hawaii impracticable, this Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking avowedly an American solution of the grave issues presented."

This latter exposition of the attitude of the United States towards Hawaii corresponds with the earlier announcement by Daniel Webster, quoted in the statement by Hon. E. H. Allen, and with the following extracts from the messages of Presidents Taylor, Fillmore, and Johnson :

*Extract from President Taylor's Message of December 4, 1849.*

\* \* \* \*

"The position of the Sandwich Islands with reference to the territory of the United States on the Pacific, the success of our persevering and benevolent citizens who have repaired to that remote quarter in Christianizing the natives and inducing them to adopt a system of government and laws suited to their capacity and wants, and the use made by our numerous whale-ships of the harbors of the Islands as places of resort for obtaining refreshment and repairs, all combine to render their destiny peculiarly interesting to us.

"It is our duty to encourage the authorities of these Islands in their efforts to improve and elevate the moral and political condition of the inhabitants; and we should make reasonable allowances for the difficulties inseparable from this task. We desire that the Islands may maintain their independence, and that other nations should concur with us in this sentiment.

"We could in no event be indifferent to their passing under the dominion of any other power.

"The principal commercial States have in this a common interest, and it is to be hoped that no one of them will attempt to interpose obstacles to the entire independence of the Islands." \* \* \*

*Extract from President Fillmore's Message of December 2, 1851.*

\* \* \* \*

"It is earnestly to be hoped that the differences which have for some time past been pending between the government of the French Republic and that of the Sandwich Islands, may be peaceably and durably adjusted, so as to secure the independence of these islands.

"Long before the events which have of late imparted so much importance to the possessions of the United States on the Pacific, we acknowledged the independence of the Hawaiian government.

"This Government was first in taking that step, and several of the leading powers of Europe immediately followed. We were influenced in this measure by the existing and prospective importance of the Islands as a place of refuge and refreshment for our vessels engaged in the whale fishery, and by the consideration that they lie

in the course of the great trade which must, at no distant day, be carried on between the western coast of North America and Eastern Asia." \* \* \*

*Extract from President Johnson's Message of December 9, 1868.*

\* \* \* \*

"The attention of the Senate and of Congress is again respectfully invited to the treaty for the establishment of commercial reciprocity with the Hawaiian Kingdom, entered into last year, and already ratified by that government."

\* \* \* \*

"It is known and felt by the Hawaiian government and people that their government and institutions are feeble and precarious; that the United States, being so near a neighbor, would be unwilling to see the Islands pass under foreign control.

"Their prosperity is continually disturbed by expectations and alarms of unfriendly political proceedings, as well from the United States as from other foreign powers.

"A reciprocity treaty, while it could not materially diminish the revenues of the United States, would be a guaranty of the good will and forbearance of all nations, until the people of the Islands shall of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union." \* \* \*

There is probably little reason to fear that a policy of so long standing is to be abandoned; but there may be danger that the influence of sugar producers (who cannot be injured in the least by the importation of the amount of sugar raised on the Hawaiian Islands) may win votes enough to weaken the moral force of the treaty and keep alive the intrigues of those who seek to undermine the influence and interest of the United States in the Pacific.

DU  
625  
P77

BOUND

MAY 28 1992

UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 04878 4923

